

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the above identified application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-29. With this response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18, and 25. Applicants herein traverse these rejections.¹

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 10-21, and 25-29

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 10-21, and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,076,557 B1 to LaMacchia et al. (“LaMacchia”). LaMacchia, however, fails to describe every element of Applicants’ amended claims. MPEP § 2131. For example, LaMacchia fails at least to disclose “the privilege information including a privilege value based, at least in part, on the untrusted class” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 1, 18, and 25. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 18, and 25, as amended, are allowable over the cited prior art.

LaMacchia discloses a system and method for “applying a grant set to a runtime call stack.” LaMacchia, col.1:21-22. According to LaMacchia, an embodiment of the disclosed system determines whether a called code assembly “has a set of one or more permission available to it, so as to be able to execute a protected operation.” LaMacchia, col. 4:56-60. Further, “evidence associated with each of the . . . code assemblies may [be] input to the policy manager,” which then “determines the permission grant set associated with each code assembly.” LaMacchia, col. 7:21-24. According to LaMacchia, the evidence used to determine the

¹ Characterizations of both the claims of the present application and the teachings of various prior art are made throughout the Office Action. Applicants do not automatically agree or acquiesce in any of these characterizations, even if they are not specifically addressed in this response.

permission grant set for a code assembly may include “the relative origin of the code assembly, the specific origin of the code assembly, date, time of day, or other trust characteristics of the code assembly.” LaMacchia, col. 7:36-41. The permission grant set is then checked “to determine whether a code frame in a given code assembly may perform a protected operation.” LaMacchia, col. 8:21-23. None of the evidence used in determining the permission grant set for one code assembly, however, includes characteristics of or information about other code assemblies. Accordingly, LaMacchia fails at least to teach or suggest the privilege information associated with the first trusted class as “including a privilege value based, at least in part, on the untrusted class” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 1, 18, and 25. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 18, and 25, as amended, are allowable over LaMacchia. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these amended independent claims.

Claims 2-6 and 10-17 depend from and include all limitations of claim 1, claims 19-21 depend from and include all limitations of claim 18, and claims 26-29 depend from and include all limitations of claim 25. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over LaMacchia for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 18, and 25 are allowable. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 2-6, 10-17, 19-21, and 26-29.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-9 and 22-24

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-9 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaMacchia in view of Papa et al., “Extending Java for Package Board Access

Control,” IEEE 2000, pp. 67-76 (hereinafter, “Reference U”). None of the cited references, however, teaches all limitations of Applicants’ claims. For example, as discussed above, LaMacchia fails to disclose “the privilege information including a privilege value based, at least in part, on the untrusted class” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 1, 18, and 25. Reference U fails to correct this deficiency.

Reference U discloses “an extension of the Java language that provides ‘programmable security’” by “augment[ing] the Java syntax with constructs for specifying various access control policies for Java packages.” Reference U, Abstract (p. 67). According to Reference U, “[a] primitive ticket based mechanism serves as the foundation for programmable security.” Reference U, Section 1. Introduction (p. 67). “Tickets embedded in messages are analogous to capabilities that convey privileges of message originators.” Reference U, Section 2.2 Authorization model (p. 68). In this system, “tickets represent keys held by subjects that match locks placed on objects.” Reference U, Section 2.2 Authorization model (p. 68). Further, “a lock and its matching key are created simultaneously” by a token. Reference U, Section 2.4. Execution model (p. 70). Reference U, however, does not disclose associating the locks and keys with an untrusted class, nor does Reference U disclose associating a privilege value with the locks and keys when these are generated by the token. Accordingly, Reference U does not teach or suggest “the privilege information including a privilege value based, at least in part, on the untrusted class” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 1, 18, and 25. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 18, and 25 are allowable over the cited prior art as amended.

Claims 7-9 depend from and include all limitations of amended claim 1, while claims 22-24 depend from and include all limitations of amended claim 18. Accordingly, these claims are

allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 18 are allowable.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 7-9 and 22-24.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 7, 2007

By: _____



Gary J. Edwards
Reg. No. 41,008

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO. EV 943277100 US
